APPENDIX

STATE OF MAINE

SUPREME JUDICIAL COURT

PORTLAND, MAINE 04111

CHARLES B. RODWAY, JR.
CLERK OF THE LAW COURT

August 7, 1967

Melvin L. Wulf, Legal Director
American Civil Liberties Union
156 Fifth Avenue
New York, New York 10010

Re: Rupert Watson d/b/a Maine-Wide Adjusters V.
State of Maine Commissioner of Banking

Dear Mr. Wulf:

Please be advised that in accordance with your request in your letter dated June 19, 1967, I mailed to the Supreme Court of the United States a certified transcript of the record in the above case on June 30, 1967. The delay in mailing the record and certifying it to the United States Supreme Court was occasioned by some difficulty which I experienced in obtaining a copy of the record of the proceedings in the Penobscot County Superior Court.

I regret this delay, and I hope it will not result in any inconvenience either to you or to the Court.

Very truly yours,

/s/ CHARLES B. RODWAY, JR.
Charles B. Rodway, Jr.

CBR, Jr/wm

STATE OF NEW YORK,
COUNTY OF NEW YORK, *ss.*:

I, BELLA GREENE, being duly sworn, depose and say that on January 26, 1967 Marvin M. Karpatkin, Esq. dictated to me the Notice of Appeal in the case of *Rupert Watson* v. *State of Maine Commissioner of Banking* (October Term, 1967, No. 332). The draft copy of that Notice of Appeal, which I typed and which is still in my possession as part of the regular case file, contains the handwritten corrections made by Mr. Karpatkin on the day I typed it. Point 3 of the draft Notice of Appeal states: "The following questions are presented by this Appeal:" There follow three questions labeled (a), (b), and (c). Question (a) relates to due process of law. Question (b) relates to a permanent bar to pursuing an occupation without any opportunity to prove rehabilitation. Question (c) reads as follows:

> "Whether the foregoing statute, on its face, and as interpreted and applied in this case, violates the prohibition against *ex post facto* laws contained in the United States Constitution, Article I, Section 10."

Question (c) relating to the *ex post facto* prohibition is now and has always been a part of the Notice of Appeal, which I typed.

/s/ BELLA GREENE

Sworn to before me this
11th day of August, 1967.

MELVIN L. WULF
Notary Public, State of New York
No. 31-4853350
Qualified in New York County
Commission Expires March 30, 1969

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

OCTOBER TERM, 1967.

WATSON, DBA MAINE-WIDE ADJUSTERS *v.* STATE OF MAINE COMMISSIONER OF BANKING.

APPEAL FROM THE SUPREME JUDICIAL COURT OF MAINE.

No. 332. Decided October 9, 1967.

PER CURIAM.

The motion to dismiss is granted and the appeal is dismissed for want of a substantial federal question.